

**KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP**

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

1200 19TH STREET, N.W.

SUITE 500

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

(202) 955-9600

NEW YORK, N.Y.  
LOS ANGELES, CA.  
MIAMI, FL.  
CHICAGO, IL.  
STAMFORD, CT.  
PARSIPPANY, N.J.

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

HONG KONG

AFFILIATED OFFICES  
NEW DELHI, INDIA  
TOKYO, JAPAN

RECEIVED  
NOV - 6 1998  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
FACSIMILE (202) 955-9792

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

November 6, 1998

JONATHAN E. CANIS

DIRECT LINE (202) 955-9664

E-MAIL: jcanis@kelleydrye.com

Magalie R. Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: **Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation by the  
Association for Local Telecommunications Services**  
Reciprocal Compensation for Local Calls to ISPs; CC Docket No. 96-98;  
CCB/CPD No. 97-30; CC Docket Nos. 98-79, 98-103, 98-161/ & 98-168


Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to § 1.1206(b)(1) of the Commission's Rules, the Association for Local Telecommunication Services ("ALTS") submits this notice of an oral *ex parte* presentation in the above-captioned docketed proceeding made on November 5, 1998. The presentations were made by Ms. Heather Gold of Intermedia Communications, Mr. Albert Kramer of Dickstein Shapiro Morin and Oshinsky, and Mr. Jonathan Canis of Kelley, Drye & Warren. The presentations were made to Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth and to his Legal Advisor, Kevin Martin. During the presentations, the parties discussed a variety of issues related to the regulatory status of dial-up calls to Internet service providers, and the mutual compensation amounts due for such calls under existing interconnection agreements. ALTS requested that the Commission clarify that any decision it may make regarding such traffic should not affect the existing interconnection agreements, or the decisions of 23 State regulatory commissions regarding them. ALTS also distributed handouts during these presentations, copies of which are attached to this filing.

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

Pursuant to 1.1206(b)(1), ALTS submits an original and one (1) copy of this oral *ex parte* notification for inclusion in the public record of each above-referenced proceedings. Please direct any questions regarding this matter to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonathan E. Canis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jonathan" and last name "Canis" clearly legible. The middle initial "E." is written in a smaller, more compact script between the first and last names.

Jonathan E. Canis

cc: Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth  
Kevin Martin, Esq.  
International Transcription Service



*Association for Local Telecommunications Services*

**THE COMMISSION CAN PRESERVE EXISTING STATE RULINGS WHILE  
RETAINING COMPLETE AUTHORITY TO BUILD A FUTURE COMPENSATION  
SYSTEM FOR INTER-CARRIER EXCHANGE OF DIAL-UP TRAFFIC TO ISPS.**

- The Commission must include specific language in its upcoming order concerning reciprocal compensation for switched calls to ISPs to insure that state decisions and existing interconnection agreements involving this traffic are not disrupted (ALTS and Time Warner have submitted such language).
- The Commission has the full authority to preserve the effectiveness of state decisions and existing interconnection agreements while retaining the discretion to create a federal reciprocal compensation model that would apply to this traffic upon the termination of the existing contracts.

**AS AMPLIFIED BY ALTS AND TIME WARNER'S EX PARTE, THE  
COMMISSION'S GTE ADSL ORDER ADVANCED THREE GROUNDS IN  
DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN SWITCHED AND SPECIAL CONNECTIONS TO ISPS  
(PARA. 2):**

**I. "...THE APPLICABILITY OF A SEPARATE BODY OF COMMISSION RULES  
AND PRECEDENT REGARDING SWITCHED ACCESS SERVICE"**

- The basic distinction between switched and special access is a fundamental aspect of telecommunications regulatory policy. The GTE ADSL Order does not alter this long standing regulatory bifurcation.
- Concerned that the assessment of switched access charges on ISPs would deter development of the Internet, the Commission has ruled that ISPs can receive switched calls via local exchange tariffs rather than by switched access (the "ESP Exemption"). The ESP Exemption has been in effect for fifteen years and been repeatedly upheld, most recently by the Eighth Circuit.
- Unless and until the Commission creates a new federal scheme for this traffic, if calls to ISPs are not compensated in the same manner as other calls terminated by LECs pursuant to local exchange tariffs, the goal of the ESP exemption will be eroded.
- The ESP exemption is currently implemented by treating calls to ISPs as "local" for all purposes, including separations, ARMIS, state rate cases, etc.

**II. "...THE APPLICABILITY OF ANY RULES AND POLICIES RELATING TO  
INTERCARRIER COMPENSATION WHEN MORE THAN ONE LOCAL EXCHANGE  
CARRIER TRANSMITS A CALL FROM AN END USER TO AN ISP"**

- As the GTE ADSL Order recognizes by raising in para. 2 the issue of intercarrier compensation, the Commission must not create a situation where no scheme is in place to compensate carriers for calls originating on ILEC networks that CLECs deliver to ISPs.
- When there is inter-company carriage, both carriers incur cost and must be compensated.
- Absent reciprocal compensation, there is no regulatory compensation scheme that would compensate ILECs and CLECs for dial-up ISP calls. Consequently, the Commission must insure no ambiguity exists during the time prior to commencement of any new federal scheme.
- As elaborated in ALTS and Time Warner's ex partes, there are at least three fundamental statutory bases that require intercarrier compensation:

- The Commission's fundamental ratemaking obligations under Sections 152(a) and 201-205 of the Act.
- The obligation under Section 202(a) to prevent discrimination when carriers perform like services by exchanging local voice traffic as compared to exchanging circuit-switched ISP traffic.
- Reciprocal compensation applies because the local "telecommunications" portion of the interstate "communications" by wire terminates at the ISP under Section 251(b)(5).
- Thus, if the Commission issues an NPRM on this issue it must adopt and ratify existing contracts pending rulemaking

### **III. "...THE APPLICABILITY OF INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENTS UNDER SECTIONS 251 AND 252 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT"**

- The agreements negotiated by ILECs and CLECs should be used to govern compensation arrangements for dial-up calls to ISPs through the end of the term of the agreements to preserve the parties' contractual expectations.